IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No. 19712 of 2006
Date of decision December 12, 2006

Ajay Mann and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Principal Govt. Polytechnic, Ambala City and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINEY MITTAL AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. BHALLA

Present:- Ms. Anu Tiwari, Advocate
for the petitioners.

****

Viney Mittal, J (Oral)

The petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of a direction to the respondents to issue provisional roll numbers to the petitioners by permitting them to appear in third semester examination of Second year of Civil Engineering in Polytechnic Institute (Boys) Ambala City.

It appears from the record that petitioners had filed a complaint under Section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Ambala on December 4, 2006. It has been noticed by the Forum, as maintained by the respondents, that the requisite roll numbers have not been issued to the petitioners on account of shortage of lectures. As against 80% of the lectures required, petitioner No.1-Ajay Mann had merely attended 48% and petitioner No.2-Raj Singh had attended 52.38% .

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has vehemently contended that as a matter of fact, the petitioners had attended all the requisite lectures but the roll numbers have not been issued to them, absolutely without any justification.

It has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that because of the fact that petitioners had made complaint against Sh. K. K. Dhiman for demanding illegal gratification, the aforesaid punitive action has been taken against the petitioners.

However, from the order dated December 7, 2006 passed by the Consumer Forum (Annexure P-1) and even from the averments made in the present petition, we do not find any justification to interfere in the present petition. In any case, as conceded by learned counsel for the petitioners, that the petitioners have already approached the State Commission challenging the order dated December 7, 2006.

In this view of the matter, we do not find any merit in the present petition. Dismissed.

(VINEY MITTAL)
JUDGE

(H.S.BHALLA)
JUDGE

December 12, 2006
archana